

I have followed the debate on Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* and was a little surprised at the reactions when I read the comments in BZN 54: 39-46 (March 1997).

I discussed the problem of figuring type material with Mrs Kaicher long ago because she was interested in figuring some type material I then had on loan from the Smithsonian Institution. She explained to me very clearly that her intention was not to interfere with taxonomic procedures, only to figure accurately as many different species as possible. Furthermore, she liked to figure type material when difficult groups were involved (in my case gastropods of the family EULIMIDAE). The reason for this was that if she did so it was more likely that her photographs would show the right species. The reason was not the other way round, i.e. that her cards should set the standard for interpretation of the name.

To suppress the *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes does not in any way reduce Kaicher's very useful contribution to identification of molluscs and cannot be considered disrespectful to an amateur who has contributed more in this field than most professionals.

**Comment on the proposed conservation of the names *Geopeltis* Regteren Altena, 1949, *Geoteuthis* Münster, 1843, *Jeletzkyteuthis* Doyle, 1990, *Loligosepia* Quenstedt, 1839, *Parabelopeltis* Naef, 1921, *Paraplesioteuthis* Naef, 1921 and *Belemnosepia montefiorei* Buckman, 1880 (Mollusca, Coleoidea)**  
(Case 2987; see BZN 53: 253-260; 54: 104)

W. Riegraf

*Brüggefeldweg 31, D-48161 Münster, Germany*

There are no doubts among coleoid researchers that the complex taxonomic meaning of *Belemnosepia* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1836 urgently needs to be resolved by the Commission. This is the intention of the application by Engeser & Donovan and it has my support.

On a point of detail, Engeser & Donovan state in their application (p. 256) that 'No type species has ever been validly designated for *Belemnosepia*. Six of the species attributed to *Belemnosepia* by d'Orbigny are type species or subjective synonyms of other genera ...', and they then list *Geopeltis* Regteren Altena, 1949, *Geoteuthis* Münster, 1843, *Jeletzkyteuthis* Doyle, 1990, *Loligosepia* Quenstedt, 1839, *Parabelopeltis* Naef, 1921 and *Paraplesioteuthis* Naef, 1921. No nominal species were originally included in *Belemnosepia* by Buckland & Agassiz. Article 69a(1)1 of the Code states that 'If no nominal species was included at the time the nominal genus or subgenus was established, the nominal species that were first subsequently and expressly included in it ... are deemed to be the only originally included nominal species'. It could be argued that the type species of *Belemnosepia* must be one of the species illustrated by Buckland (1836b of Engeser & Donovan's references) in pl. 44' which is headed 'Illustrations of the genus *Belemnosepia*'. However, this argument cannot be sustained since the text explanation of pl. 44' is headed 'Illustrations of the probable nature of the animals that gave origin to Belemnites' and includes the living *Sepia officinalis* Linnaeus, 1758. From my point of view the nominal species listed were 'expressly' included in *Belemnosepia*.